

REVIEW FRAMEWORK

2026 ODIN Grant Type 1 Full-Length Application

REVIEW & SELECTION PROCESS

- Each full-length application is appraised individually by eligible Project Review Committee (PRC) reviewers and additional by blinded international expert reviewers.
- Review questions are based on the 2026 ODIN Grant Type 1 Guidelines and Selection Criteria.
- Scored review questions are rated on a 1–6-point scale, based on the below scoring scale. Scope is assessed separately and contributes 0, 3, or 6 points per reviewer.
- Additional Discussion Factors are not included in the weighted score. They are used to support interpretation of the review, the consultation procedure, and the PRC nomination discussion.
- A consultation procedure will be implemented where relevant before the final nomination.
- Based on PRC scoring, blinded expert input, the consultation procedure, and PRC discussions, a ranked overview and nomination material will be prepared for the Steering Group.
- The Steering Group makes the final funding decision, considering the PRC nomination, consultation procedure, available budget, and overall project portfolio.

REVIEWER GUIDANCE

- Read the full application before assigning scores. Assess each criterion independently using the evidence provided in the application and supporting documents.
- Use the **full scoring range** where appropriate. The 1, 3, and 6 examples illustrate low, moderate, and outstanding performance; intermediate scores should be used when the application falls between these anchors.
- Blinded expert reviewers assess only the anonymised application material available to them. Blinded reviewers must provide comments for each question, which may be utilised during the PRC nomination process.
- PRC reviewers are not blinded and assess all materials available to them.

GENERAL SCORING SCALE

Score	Label	General meaning
1	Inadequate	Major weaknesses, serious gaps, or very low confidence.
2	Weak	Some relevant elements, but significant weaknesses or uncertainties.
3	Good-minus	Partly meets the criterion, but important weaknesses or lack of clarity remain.
4	Good	Meets the criterion to a reasonable level, but with room for strengthening.
5	Strong	Meets the criterion convincingly, with clear strengths and only minor weaknesses.
6	Outstanding	Fully meets or exceeds the criterion; clearly stands out.

1. SCIENTIFIC SCOPE & RELEVANCE TO DRUG DISCOVERY/ DIAGNOSTICS

Mainly related to application section(s): 2A-2B, 5

Assess whether the project is clearly and substantively relevant to one or more eligible 2026 ODIN Grant Type 1 (GT1) scientific scope areas, and to future drug discovery and/or diagnostics development. Scientific Scope Areas:

- **Lundbeck Foundation:** central nervous system diseases
- **Novo Nordisk Foundation (NNF):** cardiometabolic diseases, cardiovascular diseases, infectious diseases, regenerative medicine, disease-agnostic platform technologies or research tools/methods*

*For disease-agnostic platform technologies/tools/methods, consider whether the application clearly explains how the outputs could *eventually* be applied to at least one other NNF-relevant ODIN scope area.

Select one:

- 0 = No - outside scope:** The project is not clearly relevant to any eligible 2026 GT1 scientific scope area and/or to future drug discovery or diagnostics development.
- 3 = Unclear / borderline:** The project may have some relevance to an eligible scope area and to future drug discovery/diagnostics, but the connection is weak, insufficiently explained, or difficult to assess.
- 6 = Yes - in scope:** The project is clearly relevant to at least one eligible 2026 GT1 scientific scope area and has a clear connection to future drug discovery or diagnostics development.

2. SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE: RATIONALE, METHODOLOGY & NOVELTY

Mainly related to application section(s): 5, 6

How strong and innovative is the project's scientific rationale and methodological approach to addressing the defined unmet need? Consider:

- Does the project address an unmet medical, scientific, industrial, or technological need relevant to future drug discovery and/or diagnostics?
- Does it sufficiently explain the current state of the art and demonstrate clear scientific or technical novelty/edge compared with existing approaches?
- Are the proposed methodologies and/or technological solutions appropriate and sound, supported by relevant evidence or prior findings, with a credible approach to validating, benchmarking, or assessing key outputs?

SCORING EXAMPLES - SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE: RATIONALE, METHODOLOGY & NOVELTY

1 = Inadequate. The scientific case has major weaknesses or gaps in the rationale, methodology, state-of-the-art positioning, novelty, or supporting basis, resulting in very low confidence in the proposed approach.

3 = Good-minus. The project has a plausible scientific rationale and approach, but important aspects of the methodology, novelty/scientific edge, supporting evidence, or validation strategy need clarification or strengthening.

6 = Outstanding. The project presents an exceptionally convincing and well-supported scientific rationale and methodology, with clear and compelling novelty or scientific/technical edge and a strong approach to validating or assessing the key outputs.

3. OPENNESS & EXPECTED OUTPUTS

Mainly related to application section(s): 7, (9C-risk where relevant)

Is the project compatible with ODIN's open science model, with project-generated outputs that can realistically be shared openly and reused without undue restrictions? Consider:

- Is the project precompetitive, with the main outputs and sharing approach clearly described? *(Note that Business Developers for each main applicant institution have previously indicated that the proposed project appears to be precompetitive; however, you may disagree)*
- Will the outputs be openly accessible and reusable without requiring access to proprietary resources?
- Are important barriers or dependencies that could limit open sharing or reuse adequately addressed, e.g., legal/GDPR requirements, licenses, background materials/data, or third-party restrictions?

SCORING EXAMPLES - OPENNESS & EXPECTED OUTPUTS

1 = Inadequate. Major concerns remain about whether the project is precompetitive or whether key outputs can be openly shared and reused without significant restrictions.

3 = Good-minus. The project appears broadly compatible with ODIN's open model, but important aspects of the expected outputs, sharing approach, accessibility, or potential restrictions are unclear or insufficiently addressed.

6 = Outstanding. The project is clearly precompetitive, with well-defined outputs and a convincing, realistic approach to making them openly available and reusable without significant restrictions or proprietary dependencies.

4. FEASIBILITY, IMPLEMENTATION & RISK MANAGEMENT

Mainly related to application section(s): 9

Is the scientific plan credible, feasible and well-structured to deliver the proposed outcomes within the GT1 project period? Consider:

- Are the work packages, timeline, roles, decision points, milestones, success criteria, and deliverables clear, realistic, and well aligned with the project aims?
- Are key dependencies and requirements sufficiently addressed, including access to necessary resources, approvals, data, materials, expertise, or technical conditions?
- Are the main risks to successful delivery identified, with appropriate and credible mitigation strategies, workarounds, or decision points?

SCORING EXAMPLES - FEASIBILITY, IMPLEMENTATION & RISK MANAGEMENT

1 = Inadequate. Major weaknesses or gaps in the implementation plan, feasibility, dependencies, timeline, deliverables, or risk management result in low confidence that the project can be delivered as proposed.

3 = Good-minus. The project plan is broadly plausible, but important aspects of the work packages, timeline, milestones, deliverables, feasibility, dependencies, or risk mitigation need clarification or strengthening.

6 = Outstanding. The project has a clear, realistic, and well-structured implementation plan, with measurable milestones and deliverables, well-addressed feasibility and dependencies, and credible mitigation of the main risks to successful delivery.

5. TEAM COMPOSITION & INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Mainly related to application section(s): 3, 10, (9C-risk and 13-figures where relevant)

Does the project bring together a well-composed and interdisciplinary team of researchers and companies with the expertise needed to deliver the project? Consider:

- Does the team include the necessary and complementary expertise across relevant disciplines, sectors, institutions, and methods?
- Are participants' roles and contributions clear, relevant, and well-integrated?
- Are important competency gaps, dependencies, or coordination needs adequately addressed?

SCORING EXAMPLES - TEAM COMPOSITION & INTERDISCIPLINARITY

1 = Inadequate. Major competency gaps, poorly matched or unclear roles, or weak integration make the team poorly suited to deliver the project.

3 = Good-minus. The team has a plausible core of relevant expertise, but important gaps or uncertainties remain in competency coverage, participant roles, or interdisciplinary integration.

6 = Outstanding. The project has a highly relevant and well-integrated team with complementary expertise, clear roles, and strong interdisciplinary fit required for delivering the project objectives.

6. COMPANY ENGAGEMENT & IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION

Mainly related to application section(s): 3B, 10A-10B, (13-figures where relevant)

Do the company partners show meaningful engagement, with relevant in-kind contributions that support the project aims and expected outputs? Consider:

- Are the company partners' roles, expertise, resources, and in-kind contributions clear, relevant, and credible in relation to the project aims?
- Are the company partners meaningfully engaged in ways appropriate to their role and the project stage, rather than serving mainly symbolic roles?
- Are the company contributions well integrated into the work plan and consistent with the Letters of Support?

SCORING EXAMPLES - COMPANY ENGAGEMENT & IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION

1 = Inadequate. Company engagement appears minimal, largely symbolic, poorly aligned with the project, and/or in-kind contributions are unclear or clearly insufficient.

3 = Good-minus. Company engagement is plausible, but important aspects of the roles, contributions, integration, or adequacy of the in-kind support need clarification or strengthening.

6 = Outstanding. Company engagement is strong, meaningful, and well-integrated, with clear, relevant, and credible in-kind contributions that strongly support the project aims and outputs.

7. VALUE CREATION & INNOVATION PATHWAYS FOR PROJECT PARTNERS

Mainly related to application section(s): 11A

How convincingly could the project-generated outputs create value and enable downstream innovation for the project partners? Consider:

- Are the expected outputs clearly linked to meaningful value for the individual academic/non-profit applicants, company partners, and/or the whole project team?
- Are there plausible ways for the partners to build on the outputs through further research, development, or collaboration?
- Are there credible **downstream innovation pathways**, e.g., toward drug discovery, diagnostics, products, services, tools, methods, platforms, spin-outs, or future IP based on subsequent work?

SCORING EXAMPLES - VALUE CREATION & INNOVATION PATHWAYS FOR PROJECT PARTNERS

1 = Inadequate. Little or no convincing value is identified for the project partners, with no clear pathway toward further development or downstream innovation.

3 = Good-minus. Some partner value is plausible, but it is underdeveloped, narrowly framed, mainly limited to further research, and/or the downstream innovation pathways are unclear.

6 = Outstanding. The outputs have clear and compelling value for the project partners, with credible pathways to further R&D and strong potential to enable downstream innovation.

8. BROADER VALUE CREATION & INNOVATION PATHWAYS BEYOND THE PROJECT TEAM

Mainly related to application section(s): 11B

How convincingly could the project-generated outputs create value and enable downstream innovation beyond the immediate project team? Consider:

- Are the outputs likely to be **useful and relevant beyond the project team**, e.g., to researchers, companies, clinical/translational communities, disease fields, or technology areas?
- Are there plausible ways for others to build on the outputs in **further research, development, or innovation**?
- Are there credible **downstream innovation pathways**, particularly for industry beyond the current company partners, toward drug discovery, diagnostics, or enabling technologies/services?

SCORING EXAMPLES -

BROADER VALUE CREATION & INNOVATION PATHWAYS BEYOND THE PROJECT TEAM

1 = Inadequate. The expected outputs have little or no clearly articulated value beyond the immediate project team.

3 = Good-minus. Some broader value is plausible, but it appears narrow, mainly academic, of limited industry relevance, and/or the downstream innovation pathways are underdeveloped.

6 = Outstanding. The outputs have clear and compelling value beyond the project team, with strong potential for further R&D and clear downstream innovation pathways for industry.

9. BUDGET

Mainly related to application section(s): 12

Is the proposed budget realistic, proportionate, and sufficient to support the planned work and expected outputs? Consider:

- Are the main cost drivers, including large or unusual expenses, clearly justified and aligned with the planned activities?
- Are institutional allocations, unfunded applicant contributions, bench fees, subcontractor costs, co-financing, and other contributions sufficiently explained (where relevant)?
- Does the budget provide the resources needed to carry out the project as proposed, or are there important omissions, imbalances, or under- or over-resourcing concerns?

SCORING EXAMPLES - BUDGET

1 = Inadequate. The budget appears unrealistic, disproportionate, poorly justified, or raises major concerns about whether the project can be delivered as proposed.

3 = Good-minus. The budget seems plausible, but uncertainty remains because key cost drivers, large or unusual expenses, institutional allocations, unfunded contributions, or co-financing are only partly explained, or because some costs appear generic, imbalanced, or insufficiently linked to the planned work.

6 = Outstanding. The budget is realistic, proportionate, and well justified, with resources appropriately allocated to support the planned work and expected outputs.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION FACTORS

These non-weighted questions are used for PRC discussion and process planning.

NOT WEIGHTED 1: WILD IDEA POTENTIAL

Does the project present an unusually bold, creative, or high-risk/high-reward concept that should be highlighted during PRC discussion? Briefly explain the wild idea potential or why it was difficult to assess, if relevant.

Score	Label	Meaning
1	No wild idea potential	The project does not appear especially bold, creative, or high-risk/high-reward.
2	Limited or unclear wild idea potential	The project has some potentially bold or creative elements, but they are limited, not central, or difficult to assess from the application.
3	Some wild idea potential	The project includes clearly ambitious, creative, or high-risk/high-reward elements that should be considered during PRC discussion.
4	Exceptional wild idea potential	The project is unusually bold or original, with substantial potential upside that may not be fully captured by the scored criteria.

NOT WEIGHTED 2: COMMENTS FOR CONSULTATION PROCEDURE

Have you identified one or more specific issues that could negatively affect the funding decision and that the applicant may need an opportunity to clarify, correct, or respond to?

No/Yes (provide comment)

Further Information:

- This question helps identify issues that may need to be presented to the applicant as part of a formal consultation procedure. The procedure gives applicants an opportunity to respond to unfavourable information or concerns that may be important to the funding decision before the final PRC nomination.
- Use this field only for specific factual issues, inconsistencies, or relevant external information that could negatively affect the funding decision and that the applicant could clarify, correct, or respond to. General strengths, weaknesses, scoring rationale, or suggestions for improvement belong in the scored criteria and/or Overall Fundability & Reviewer Summary. Some examples for this section:
 - **Relevant scientific information not addressed in the application:** e.g., a key publication or finding that could affect the assessment of novelty, scientific rationale, methodology, or feasibility.
 - **Potential conflict of interest or other external information:** e.g., an undisclosed relationship, affiliation, restriction, or other circumstance that could affect eligibility, impartiality, openness, feasibility, or fundability.
 - **Inconsistency within the application:** e.g., a timeline that conflicts with a required approval/dependency, planned work or resources missing from the budget, or conflicting budget and project information.
 - **Unresolved scientific, financial, or implementation dependency:** e.g., reliance on a key hypothesis, co-funding, personnel, data, materials, approvals, or software that is not clearly supported, secured, or available.

NOT WEIGHTED 3: OVERALL FUNDABILITY & REVIEWER SUMMARY

Taking the application as a whole, how strongly do you recommend funding the project, assuming sufficient funds are available?

Briefly summarise the main factors driving your recommendation, including the most important strengths, weaknesses, risks, or trade-offs for PRC discussion.

	Recommendation	Meaning
1	Not fundable	Major concerns remain that make the project unsuitable for funding.
2	Borderline/Weak	The project has meaningful strengths, but important weaknesses or uncertainties make the case for funding unconvincing.
3	Fundable	The project has a convincing overall case and should be considered for funding as submitted.
4	Strongly fundable	A stand-out project with a highly compelling case for funding.